



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/421,629	10/19/1999	JAY M. SHORT	DIVER1260-3	4408

7590

05/27/2003

LISA A HAILE
GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP
4365 EXECUTIVE DRIVE
SUITE 1100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121-2133

EXAMINER

NASHED, NASHAAT T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1652

25

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/421,629

Applicant(s)
Short et al.

Examiner
Nashaat T. Nashed

Art Unit
1652



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 17, 2003
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 48-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 48-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 7, 2003 has been entered.

The application has been amended as requested in the communication filed April 17, 2003. Accordingly, claims 1-47 have been canceled, and claims 48-58 have been entered.

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because it contains improper claimed priority information. Specifically, it claims priority to serial number 09/089,789 filed June 3, 1998, which is a CIP of serial number 09/034,724, filed March 4, 1998, which is a CIP of 08/665,565 filed June 18, 1996.

The drawings are objected to because of the defects noted on the attached PTO-498. Correction is required.

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claims 50 and 51 are objected to under 37 CFR § 1.75(d)(1) as being in improper form because the claim states an improper Markush group. Compounds included within a Markush group must "(1) share a common utility and (2) share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility." (See MPEP § 803.02.) The enzymes in claims 50 and 51 do not share common structure or function, and therefore, the Markush group is improper.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 48-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 48-58 are directed to all possible biomolecules and bioactivities isolated by a method comprising generating a cDNA or genomic library from nucleic acid obtained from a plurality of species. This encompasses any protein, peptide, polypeptide, enzyme, amino acid, fatty acid, fat, nucleoside, nucleotide, nucleoside diphosphate, nucleoside triphosphate, nucleic acid including RNA and DNA, NADPH, NADH, any enzyme cofactor, any vitamin, any polyketide known or unknown, and any natural product having any chemical structure or function isolated from any biological source. The specification, however, does not provide a single representative species from any biological source encompassed by these claims. There is no disclosure of any particular structure or properties of the bioactivity or biomolecules other than that they are obtained by a general screening method. Claims 50 and 51 limit the bioactivity to several non-specific enzymatic activity, whereas claim 58 limits the bioactivity to polyketide synthase. As mentioned above, The specification fails to describe any specific biomolecule or bioactivity by any structure or properties. Given this lack of description of the biomolecule or bioactivity as encompassed by the claims, Applicants have failed to sufficiently describe the claimed invention, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms that a skilled artisan would recognize Applicants were in possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 48-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "bioactivity or biomolecule" in claims 48-58 render the claims indefinite because the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. For examination purposes only, the phrase is taken to mean any protein, peptide, polypeptide, enzyme, enzyme cofactor, natural product of any chemical structure, naturally occurring amino acid, naturally occurring nucleotide or nucleoside, sugar, saccharides, and polysaccharide.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 48-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the commercial availability of numerous natural products such as streptogramins, streptomycin and erythromycin, vitamins, enzymes cofactors such as NADH or NADPH, amino acids, nucleosides and nucleotides, commercial enzymes such as subtilisines, lipases, protein kinases, oxidases and glucosidases as well as the nucleic acids sequences, proteins, peptides and enzymes known in commercial databases. The patentability of the product of a method resides in the product itself and not the method by which it is made or identified. Applicant should note that detergent composition containing enzymatic activities such as proteases, lipases, oxidases and glycosidases, sugar, glucose, fructose, vitamins, fatty acids, fat, select amino acids and many natural products are sold in grocery stores, health food stores and pharmacies. Also, laboratory supply houses such as SIGMA and PHARMACIA provides many of the biomolecules and bioactivities encompassed by the claims.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nashaat T. Nashed, Ph. D. whose telephone number is (703) 305-6586. The examiner can normally be reached Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapura Achutamurthy, can be reached on (703) 308-3804. The fax phone numbers for this Group are (703) 305-3014 and (703)308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



Nashaat T. Nashed, Ph. D.
Primary Examiner